



Some Aspects of the Slavonic Renaissance

Author(s): Henrik Birnbaum

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 47, No. 108 (Jan., 1969), pp. 37-56

Published by: the [Modern Humanities Research Association](#) and [University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4206048>

Accessed: 13/06/2014 04:33

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Some Aspects of the Slavonic Renaissance*

HENRIK BIRNBAUM

I

CHARACTERISING the research situation, the *Stand der Forschung*, concerning the Slavonic Renaissance, a reference may be appropriate to the traditional and in many quarters still valid saying: *Slavica non leguntur*. Western studies of the Renaissance, while pursued vigorously since the turn of the century, have largely failed to encompass the relevant developments in Eastern Europe.¹ This, of course, applies primarily to one, though central, facet of Slavonic Renaissance culture, namely, to literature in the vernacular. As regards other achievements of Slavonic men in the age of the Renaissance, for example, in the field of the fine arts or, in particular, in science, it can be said that their accomplishments and discoveries have to a much larger extent received due attention from Western students of the Renaissance. One could mention the Pole Nicholas Copernicus (Mikołaj Kopernik) who, educated at the University of Cracow, made his country famous by the publication of his epoch-making works in astronomy, which laid the foundations of the heliocentric system subsequently elaborated by Galileo Galilei and others. Naturally, Copernicus' writings were in Latin (cf., in particular, his fundamental *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*), as were the works of many Slavonic writers not only on scientific but also on historical, religious, political and philosophical topics; as another example one might refer to the internationally renowned work *Commentarii de Republica emendanda* by the 16th-century Polish thinker Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski, first published in Basel in 1554 and soon thereafter translated not only into Polish but also into several western European languages. It goes without saying that these works, originally published in Latin and therefore accessible to international scholarship, have frequently been considered in studies on the European Renaissance. Only a far more peripheral attention has, on the other hand, been given by scholars not conversant with Slavonic languages to the Latin works of those Slavonic Renaissance men of letters whose main literary achievements lay

* Revised version of a paper read before the Medieval and Renaissance Club, Los Angeles, California, on 18 January 1968.

¹ Cf., for example, the recent Slavonic Renaissance scholarship report by S. Harrison Thomson in *Renaissance News*, XVIII, New York, 1965, pp. 81–84.

in their own native tongue. This is true, among others, of the greatest poet of the Slavonic Renaissance, Jan Kochanowski, a writer intimately familiar with, and to a large extent dependent on, classical authors as well as the writers of the early Renaissance and his own contemporaries, ranging from Petrarch to Ronsard and Erasmus.² Western scholarship has not even properly assessed his literary achievements in Latin, thus altogether excluding this outstanding Renaissance figure from the total spectrum of this period of European civilisation. Applying the same point to Dalmatia, another centre of Slavonic Renaissance writings, similar considerations come to mind as regards the Latin as well as Italian writings of some of the poets and playwrights who achieved fame by their works in the Croatian vernacular. Thus the plays and poetry of such Ragusan writers as Nikola Nalješković or Martin Držić, Dominko Zlatarić or Dinko Ranjina cannot be adequately evaluated without taking into account also the impact made on these writers by Italian Renaissance literature, and it is only against this background that we may attempt to establish the much debated degree of originality of their literary output.³ In this connection it may be pointed out, incidentally, that some writers with primarily literary aspirations also contributed scientific, political or philosophical works, which as a rule were published, not in Slavonic but in Latin or Italian. In this respect too, therefore, they were typical representatives of the Renaissance. Thus the playwright and poet Nalješković is also the author of a mathematical-astronomical treatise, *Dialogo sopra la sfera del mondo*, which appeared in Venice in 1579.

If in the following we shall limit ourselves to discussing primarily certain aspects of Slavonic Renaissance literature proper—literature here to be understood in the narrow sense of *belles-lettres*—it is not because other manifestations of Renaissance civilisation in the Slavonic lands do not deserve our attention, as indeed they do, but rather because this seems to be the most widely neglected segment of the Slavonic Renaissance among western scholars unfamiliar with any Slavonic language. At the same time, it is perhaps the most intriguing side of the Slavonic Renaissance, as testified to by the numerous and penetrating studies carried out, often on a comparative basis, by Slavonic students of literature and by Slavists throughout the world.

² Cf. Z. Szmydtowa, 'Erazm z Rotterdamu a Kochanowski' and 'Kochanowski na tle polskiego i europejskiego Renesansu', in: *Poeci i poetyka*, Warsaw, 1964, pp. 68–100, 139–58; and I. N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, *Ital'janskoye Vozrozhdeniye i slavyanskiye literaturny XV–XVI vekov*, Moscow, 1963, pp. 273–94, with further references.

³ For details see, among others, my contribution 'Renaissance Drama in Ragusa' (to appear in the forthcoming *Proceedings of the UCLA Conference on the Theater in Transition: Medieval-Renaissance*, Berkeley and Los Angeles); cf. further in particular I. N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–124.

II

Next, let us briefly examine the very notion of a specifically Slavonic Renaissance, again limiting ourselves, for the moment, to literature. Is it actually appropriate to speak of a Slavonic Renaissance as a whole, that is to say, of a peculiar Slavonic variety of the writings of that epoch? It seems that, although convenient as a handy label, the notion of a distinct and internally integrated Slavonic Renaissance essentially lacks substance. No specifically Slavonic common denominator of Renaissance culture or literature can in fact be ascertained. Rather, each national variety of Slavonic Renaissance literature can be viewed in a way similar to the literatures of most other European countries of that period, i.e., as an independent whole characterised by its own specifics and either as an extension of some other national Renaissance literature (as, for instance, in the case of the Croatian literature of Dalmatia in its relationship to Italy) or as an integral part of the overall range of European Renaissance writing (as in the case of Poland and, to some extent, also of Bohemia-Moravia).

Moreover, it must be remembered that we can speak of a strong, decidedly Renaissance type of literature only in some, but not all, of the Slavonic countries. Thus, while a secular Renaissance and humanist literature, in Latin as well as in the vernacular, flourished in the 16th century in Croatian Dalmatia, notably in Ragusa-Dubrovnik, and in Poland (as well as in Hungary), the situation was slightly different in Bohemia and Moravia. As a result of the Hussite heresy and the subsequent wars, Bohemia had become to some degree culturally isolated from Western Europe. The early humanism of the court of Charles IV and his sons Václav IV and Sigismund in the 14th century and the first decades of the 15th century had been superseded by Hussite nationalism with little interest in genuine humanistic studies of universal outlook. While we know of some contacts and interchanges of ideas between Western humanists, for example Erasmus, and Czech scholars and men of letters (such as the philosopher Jan Šlechta), it would be unfounded to speak of any truly humanist movement in Bohemia-Moravia in the 15th and 16th centuries. Yet there were some remarkable exceptions, such as the outstanding neo-Latin poet and humanist Bohuslav Hasistein of Lobkovice (B. Hasištejnský z Lobkovic) and his brother Jan, the latter writing both in Latin and in Czech (cf., for example, his pilgrimage account, *Putování léta Páně 1493 k svatému hrobu vykonané*, and his instruction for his son, *Zpráva a naučení synu Jaroslavovi o tom, co činiti a čeho nechati*). A new, religiously oriented humanism, inspired not by Italy but by Luther's and Melancthon's Germany,

the so-called Wittenberg school, began to make headway at Prague University in the 1520s and 1530s, appealing, among others, to the Unity of Czech Brethren, one of the most significant spiritual descendants of the Hussite movement. However, the Habsburg rulers, whose power was formally established in Bohemia-Moravia in 1526, soon welcomed and efficiently supported the new instrument of the Counter-Reformation, the order of the Jesuits (founded in 1534), thus virtually preventing all further spread of secular Renaissance ideas. Less than a hundred years later, as a consequence of the defeat of the Bohemians in the battle of the White Mountain in 1620, Bohemia-Moravia's status of relative independence within the Habsburg empire came to an end. This event marks the beginning of a general decline in Czech culture which lasted until the 19th century.⁴

III

Thus, while Renaissance and humanism never fully developed in Czech literature, there can be no doubt that the Czechs (as well as the Slovaks and the Slovenes) in the late Middle Ages and at the beginning of modern times belonged to the same general sphere of European civilisation as the Poles and the Croats. This sphere was oriented toward the West, based on the Latinity of medieval writings, and largely dominated by the Roman Catholic Church and its cultural legacy. On the other hand, the Slavonic peoples which adhered to the Greek Orthodox variety of Christendom, namely, the Serbs, the Bulgarians and the Russians (in a broad sense, including the Ukrainians and Belorussians, about to emerge as separate nationalities), formed part of an eastern sphere of civilisation (centred upon Byzantium) with various manifestations in art, literature and thought. To understand why the Greek Orthodox Slavs did not participate in the European Renaissance, except, perhaps, in a very rudimentary and peripheral manner, it may be useful to focus our attention briefly on the tradition of classical studies in Byzantium itself. In addition, as regards the literature of Serbia, Bulgaria and Russia in the 15th and 16th centuries, a few words about the underlying, largely unified Church Slavonic tradition in South and East Slavonic writings may be appropriate.

⁴ Cf., I. N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, *op. cit.*, pp. 170-210; D. Čiževsky, *Outline of Comparative Slavic Literatures*, Boston, 1952, pp. 37-41, 48-49; F. Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization*, New Brunswick, N.J., 1962, pp. 183-211, 286-97 and 322-3, with rich bibliography; J. Hrabák *et al.*, *Dějiny české literatury*, I, *Starší česká literatura*, Prague, 1959, pp. 283-379. See also I. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, 'Cheshskiy gumanist Boguslav Lobkovic i Erazm Rotterdamsky' (*Slavyane*, 12, Moscow, 1958, pp. 49-50); *id.*, 'Gumanisticheskoye napravleniye v cheshskoy literature XV-XVI vekov' (*Vestnik istorii mirovoy kul'tury*, 2, Moscow, 1960, pp. 32-50). On problems of the Renaissance and humanism in Slovakia, see the recent contribution by P. Ratkoš, 'Die Problematik des Humanismus und der Renaissance in der Slowakei', in: J. Irmscher (ed.) *Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, II, Berlin, 1962, pp. 270-8.

There was undoubtedly an essential difference between Byzantium and Western Europe in their respective approaches to classical antiquity. The Byzantines had remained keenly aware of their classical heritage. If it has sometimes been claimed that in the Middle Ages man had a thorough knowledge of ancient Greek and Roman culture and literature, this is certainly far truer of Byzantium than of Western Europe. Throughout the entire Byzantine period there were scholars and writers intimately familiar with the classical tradition. Since the role of this spiritual heritage in Byzantine intellectual history has not yet been fully identified, it may be somewhat premature to generalise and even tentatively to define anything like a 'revival of classical antiquity' in Byzantium. There was never any need for the Byzantines to 'discover' classical antiquity as something entirely new. Classical tradition formed an integral part of Byzantine culture and as such underwent its own development. This, among other things, explains one of the fundamental differences in the history of Byzantine civilisation as compared to that of Western Europe in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance period. A western writer who had 'discovered' classical antiquity for himself was, as a result, much more apt to arrive at a personal and unprejudiced interpretation of the pagan tradition of Greco-Roman culture than was his Byzantine counterpart, thoroughly familiar with this inherited and well-established tradition. In the course of Byzantine history one can further note not only a surprisingly close acquaintance with classical, heathen antiquity but also numerous attempts to reconcile classical paganism and Christianity, with the object of blending the two as smoothly as possible into one consistent whole. However, despite their thorough knowledge of pagan antiquity and their frequent occasions to broaden and deepen this knowledge, the Byzantines, with few exceptions, retained a typically medieval conception of, and attitude towards, antiquity. Interpreting the classics allegorically or symbolically, most of the Byzantine thinkers were unable and unwilling to see in pagan classical antiquity the very opposite of Christianity—a concept largely adopted by the men of the Renaissance in Western Europe, particularly in Italy. Among the rather few Byzantines who advocated such an unorthodox view, the 11th-century philosopher John Italus and, considerably later, George Gemisthus Pletho deserve mention. The latter's Renaissance orientation must be seen in the light of Byzantine-Italian cultural relations, which were greatly strengthened in the late 14th and 15th centuries.⁵

⁵ Cf. I. Dujčev, 'L'Umanesimo di Giovanni Italo', in: *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, 5 (*Atti del V Congresso internazionale di studi bizantini*, I, Rome, 1939), pp. 432-6; G. M. Khartman (Hartmann), 'Znachenije grecheskoy kul'tury dlya razvitiya ital'yanskogo gumanizma' (*Vizantijskiy Vremennik*, XV, Moscow, 1959, pp. 100-24); K. M. Setton,

It is against this Byzantine background that we have to see the absence of a genuine Renaissance culture in Bulgaria and Serbia, with a spiritual centre such as the monastic community of Mount Athos as a prime transmitter and disseminator of Byzantine culture and religious thought among the Orthodox Slavs.⁶ The classical heritage was assessed in medieval Bulgaria in a way largely analogous to its interpretation in neighbouring Byzantium, as testified to, among other things, already by the writings of John the Exarch in the late 9th and early 10th centuries;⁷ and with the advent of the Turks and their subsequent conquest of the Balkans in the 14th and 15th centuries the rudimentary Renaissance elements in medieval Bulgarian culture virtually ceased to exist. It was not until the national revival at the end of the 18th and in the 19th century that the Bulgarians adopted a truly secular approach to classical antiquity, especially to ancient Greek civilisation.⁸

What has been said here about the virtual absence of Renaissance and humanist writings in Bulgaria applied essentially also to Serbia, even though the close dependence on Byzantine cultural models and patterns was perhaps felt less strongly in Serbia than in Bulgaria (including Macedonia) with its geographical proximity to Byzantium. Moreover, there continued to exist some intellectual and spiritual ties linking Serbia (as well as Bosnia) to Croatia—both to the Dalmatian littoral with its flourishing Renaissance culture and to inland or 'Pannonian' Croatia, whose likewise thriving civilisation in the Renaissance period formed part of a complex Hungarian–Croatian cultural subsphere, of which the great neo-Latin poet and political writer Janus Pannonius, alias Ivan Česmički, was the most famous literary exponent.⁹

IV

Another, related factor to be taken into consideration in any attempt to explain the remarkable resistance of the Greek Orthodox Slavs

'The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance' (*Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 100, Philadelphia, 1956, pp. 1–76); and also, e.g., D. J. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, Cambridge, Mass., 1962. For a summary treatment of these aspects of Byzantine intellectual history and Byzantine–Latin interchange, see now S. Vryonis, *Byzantium and Europe*, London, 1967, pp. 110–19, 145–50, 162–4 and 178–83.

⁶ Cf. I. Dujčev, 'Le Mont Athos et les Slaves au Moyen Âge' (*Medioevo Bizantino-Slavo*, Rome, 1965, pp. 487–510, with further references).

⁷ Cf. I. Dujčev, 'Klassisches Altertum im mittelalterlichen Bulgarien' (*ibid.*, pp. 467–85).

⁸ Cf. A. K. Burmov, 'Renaissance-Elemente im mittelalterlichen Bulgarien', in: J. Irmscher (ed.) *Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa I*, Berlin, 1962, pp. 357–62; Chr. Gandevev, 'Die antike Kultur in der Zeit der bulgarischen nationalen Wiedergeburt (1780–1877)' (*ibid.*, pp. 363–71).

⁹ Cf. I. N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, *Ital'yanskoye Vozrozhdeniye . . .*, pp. 126–68, esp. 134–42 (on Janus Pannonius); see further, for example, J. Matl, *Europa und die Slaven*, Wiesbaden, 1964, pp. 119–37.

to profane Renaissance culture, its ideas, concepts and literary expression, is the strong Church Slavonic literary tradition with its unifying and mutually influencing effects. This tradition was by no means only a strictly linguistic one. Rather, it included all the rich repertoire of vocabulary, phraseology and imagery ultimately patterned after the model of Byzantine stylistic devices and perpetuated as a powerful poetic stimulus in the literary languages of the Orthodox Slavs. As Roman Jakobson has pointed out in his brilliant essay 'The Kernel of Comparative Slavic Literature', in which he discusses at some length also the Church Slavonic literary tradition and its role, a man like Constantine the Grammarian (also known as Constantine of Kostenec or the Philosopher), a learned Bulgarian active at the Serbian court in the early 15th century, 'grasped perfectly the international nature of this tongue [i.e., Church Slavonic] which could not be identified with either the Bulgarian or Serbian vernaculars.' Jakobson goes on to emphasise that 'as long as Church Slavonic dominated the literatures of the Greek Orthodox Slavs, the ties linking these literatures to each other and to their common past remained very strong.'¹⁰ The attribution of the Church Slavonic literary tradition to the Slavonic peoples which adhered to the Greek Orthodox form of the Christian faith, that is, to those Slavs by and large alien to, or rather, incapable of developing any genuine Renaissance culture, can, of course, be considered justified only with reference to the later phases of this literary tradition but not to its earlier medieval stages when, as is well known, Church Slavonic writing, largely in the Glagolitic alphabet, was particularly prominent in areas of the Slavonic world subsequently dominated by Latin (or western) civilisation and by the Roman Catholic Church, namely, in Moravia, Bohemia, Slavic Pannonia and Croatia.

In recent years it has been suggested, in particular by the Italian Slavist Riccardo Picchio, that one may define, within the broader framework of what can be termed the Slavonic Middle Ages in a primarily philological sense, the more specific notion of a Slavonic Orthodox community ('Slavia ortodossa', in his terminology) as a religious and cultural unity of considerable coherence, characterised linguistically to a large extent by the various local recensions of Church Slavonic.¹¹ As a cultural phenomenon this predominantly

¹⁰ R. Jakobson, 'The Kernel of Comparative Slavic Literature' (*Harvard Slavic Studies*, I, Harvard, 1953, pp. 1-71, esp. 49-55; the quotations are from pp. 49 and 50 respectively).

¹¹ Cf. particularly R. Picchio, 'Die historisch-philologische Bedeutung der kirchenslavischen Tradition' (*Die Welt der Slaven*, VII, Wiesbaden, 1962, pp. 1-27 esp. 14 ff.); *id.*, 'A proposito della Slavia ortodossa e della comunità linguistica slava ecclesiastica' (*Ricerche Slavistiche*, XI, Rome, 1963, pp. 105-27); *id.*, 'Slave ecclésiastique, slavons et rédactions', *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, ed. by P. de Ridder, The Hague/Paris, 1967,

medieval inter-Slavonic spiritual community (if, indeed, such an entity can be identified) and the body of literature it produced persisted far into what are generally considered modern times and, at any rate, throughout the period of the Renaissance in European history.

V

What has been said so far about the lack of a genuine indigenous Renaissance culture among the Orthodox Balkan Slavs, the Bulgarians and the Serbs, applies, with some minor qualifications, also to the Eastern Slavs, that is, to the Russians in a broad sense. The underlying causes of this specific lack were largely the same: the impact of Byzantine civilisation with its particular 'medieval' relationship to classical antiquity and the prevalence of a unifying conservative Church Slavonic literary tradition heavily dependent on Byzantine sources and models. This is not the proper context, however, to elaborate on the well-known aspects of medieval Russian intellectual and religious life, which was strongly influenced by the manifold manifestations of Byzantine culture and ideology. If the Turks' swamping of the Balkans—beginning with their landing near Gallipoli in the middle of the 14th century, culminating in the capture of Constantinople in 1453, and ending with the Turkish victory in the battle of Mohács in 1526—can perhaps be considered the main political and social obstacle to any free development of Renaissance culture among the Balkan Slavs, this ordeal has its counterpart in Russian history in the Mongol flood of the 13th to 15th centuries which covered most of the Russian territory and thus cut that vast land off from any significant connection with the west. It is one of the particularly noteworthy aspects of Russian intellectual history that there is no place in it for a genuine Russian variety of the Renaissance (comparable, say, to Polish or Croatian Renaissance culture). The political, social and cultural reasons for the existence of this gap are today generally fairly well understood. However, recently two periods of Russian history have been re-evaluated by Soviet specialists who have claimed that a relationship to Renaissance culture is evident in each. The late 14th and early 15th centuries are said to contain elements of a 'pre-Renaissance' in Russia, while the other period allegedly shows the existence of humanism in western Russia (or Ruthenia), that is, in the Polish-controlled Ukraine and Belorussia, and its spread to Muscovite Russia in the 16th and 17th centuries.

pp. 1527–44. See further also my forthcoming paper 'Grundkonzept und Aufgabenkreis einer vergleichenden kirchenslavischen Literaturforschung' (to be published in *Annales Instituti Slavici* . . . *Acta Congressus historiae Slavicae Salisburgensis* . . . 1967).

The recent reinterpretation of the movement known in Russian cultural history as the Second South Slavonic Influence is primarily connected with the name of the eminent Soviet scholar D. S. Likhachov. According to him, this new trend in Old Russian art and literature can be viewed as forming part of a supranational pre-Renaissance culture encompassing, in addition to Russia, Byzantium, Bulgaria, Serbia, the Caucasus and, to some extent, Asia Minor.¹² The term Second South Slavonic Influence refers to the reintensification of the South Slavonic and, indirectly, Byzantine cultural impact on Russia which resulted from the arrival of Bulgarian and Serbian artists and *literati* who had escaped from their native lands when these were threatened or occupied by the Turks. (The first such influence from the south, mainly from Bulgaria and Byzantium, had occurred in Russian history in connection with and during the centuries immediately following the official conversion of Kievan Russia to Christianity in 988/9.)

Among the South Slavs who now came to Russia and engaged in fruitful literary activity there we may mention such an outstanding figure as the Bulgarian preacher, hagiographer and later metropolitan of Kiev Grigori Tsamblak, a disciple of the 14th-century Bulgarian patriarch and religious and linguistic reformer Yevtimiy (Euthymius) Tărnovski. Another such South Slav was the controversial, though certainly highly typical hagiographer Pakhomiy Logofet (also called the Serb), one of the representatives of the new ornamental style known as *pletēniye sloves* (literally, 'word-braiding').¹³ However, the undisputed master of this new stylistic ornamentation as well as of the hagiographic genre was a native Russian, Yepifaniy Premudryy (the Wise), the author of the two famous Old Russian Lives of St Stefan of Perm' and of St Sergiy of Radonezh.¹⁴ Both in subject matter and in characterisation, Yepifaniy, while skilfully utilising traditional themes and techniques, also introduces new stylistic and psychological devices which in more than one way convey an air of almost modern realism. In Russian art of that period the greatest name, overshadowing even that of the immigrant Feofan Grek (Theophanes the Greek),¹⁵ is that of the fresco- and icon-painter Andrey Rublyov. While his artistic oeuvre undoubtedly can be considered the very epitome of Russian medieval painting,

¹² See D. S. Likhachov, 'Nekotoryye zadachi izucheniya vtorogo yuzhnoslavianskogo vliyaniya v Rossii', in: *Issledovaniya po slavyanskomu literaturovedeniyu i fol'kloristike*, Moscow, 1960, pp. 95–151; *id.*, *Kul'tura Rusi vremeni Andreyana Rublyova i Yepifaniya Premudrogo (konets XIV-nachalo XV v.)*, Moscow/Leningrad, 1962.

¹³ Cf., on Tsamblak's literary output, for example, D. Čiževskij, *History of Russian Literature*, The Hague, 1960, pp. 163–65; on Pakhomiy, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 180–4.

¹⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 167–80.

¹⁵ On Theophanes the Greek (Feofan Grek), see now also K. Onasch, 'Theophanes der Grieche. Ein Maler der Frührenaissance in Russland' (*Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, I, pp. 376–86).

his technique and general conception of art reveal at the same time certain characteristic features which previously had not been encountered in medieval art and paralleled a similar new trend in Byzantine art of the Palaeologan period. In general it can be said that if some of the new forms and attitudes in Russian art and literature of the late 14th and early 15th centuries can indeed be interpreted as signalling a pre-Renaissance spirit and approach, then this foreshadowing of the Renaissance must, once again, be seen in connection with similar phenomena in the cultural life of Byzantium. If, in other words, we are to accept Likhachov's basic thesis that some sort of pre-Renaissance existed in late medieval Russia, the centre of this new supranational trend is to be found in the 'Palaeologan Renaissance', characteristic of the final period of political and social decline in Byzantine history. In turn, the most significant aspect of Palaeologan intellectual and artistic life was the contact and exchanges between the Greek and Italian humanists and artists of the Trecento and Quattrocento.¹⁶ It is important, however, to keep in mind that while the term pre-Renaissance (*predvozrozhdeniye*) is perhaps appropriate to describe the new trend in late medieval Russian literature and art, these new forms of expression and content were not yet truly in the Renaissance spirit, using this term in the Western European sense, but rather retained, to a large degree, a religious motivation marked by what may be called late Gothic mysticism, emotionalism and artistic expressionism. While there was clearly a common supranational, largely Byzantine-Eastern European, denominator of this pre-Renaissance civilisation, it is undoubtedly also possible to identify national traits, continuing local traditions, in the various geographical sub-spheres of this overall late medieval Greek Orthodox culture; no doubt Russia was one such sub-sphere. Moreover, a certain correlation can be ascertained between the themes and means of expression in verbal and iconographic art in 14th- and 15th-century Russia.¹⁷

VI

Renaissance culture and humanism of the Western European coinage reached Russia only relatively late, by way of Poland-Lithuania and the west Russian territories controlled by the Polish state. How late and to what degree Renaissance culture actually did penetrate into Muscovite Russia is still the subject of considerable controversy. Thus, for example, the West German Slavist Maximilian Braun has

¹⁶ Cf. S. Vryonis, *op. cit.*, pp. 178-86.

¹⁷ For further discussion of complexity and integration of the Russian pre-Renaissance, see esp. D. S. Likhachov, *Kul'tura Rusi . . .*, pp. 161-70.

stated emphatically that one cannot, in fact, speak of any real entry of humanism even into 17th-century Russia since we know of virtually no original humanistic work carried out by a Russian writer or scholar. Rather, what had been imported to Russia by that time was a new, general European outlook and concept of life inspired by western Renaissance and humanism.¹⁸ It was this new spirit and understanding that, to some extent at least, formed a fertile ground for the drastic changes and reforms implemented in the beginning of the 18th century by Peter the Great. This fairly negative view of humanism in pre-Petrine Russia has been challenged by the Soviet literary scholar M. P. Alekseyev, who has tried to show 'that Russian culture of the 15th to 17th century in its manifold manifestations was in no way as remote from the humanistic culture of the Renaissance period as is generally believed and that we have every right to speak of instances of humanism on Russian territory in that period.'¹⁹ Yet Alekseyev has to concede that it would be unrealistic to consider, for example, the prolific 16th-century writer Maxim the Greek (Maksim Grek), educated at Mount Athos and in Italy at the height of the Renaissance, as the first connecting link between Russian literature and western learning (as was once suggested by the famous literary historian A. N. Pypin), since this Greek-Italian emigrant in Russia remained basically alien to the secular ideas of the Italian Renaissance and humanism. An ardent admirer of Savonarola, Maxim the Greek retained throughout his life a characteristically 'medieval' world view.²⁰ Or, to mention another case, the marriage in 1472 of the Russian grand prince Ivan III to the Byzantine-Italian princess Zoe (who subsequently changed her name to Sophia), niece of the last Byzantine emperor, while it brought Italy and the Muscovite state closer together politically and culturally, does not seem to have had any particular impact on Russian literature. Much greater was the influence of the Italian Renaissance on Russian art, especially on architecture. As examples of the combination of Italian Renaissance art with the traditional Russian style of architecture, several buildings of the Moscow Kremlin (including some of its cathedrals) may be mentioned.²¹ To be sure, Alekseyev

¹⁸ Cf. M. Braun, 'Das Eindringen des Humanismus in Russland im 17. Jahrhundert' (*Die Welt der Slaven*, I, 1956, pp. 35-49).

¹⁹ See M. P. Alekseyev, 'Yavleniya gumanizma v literature i publitsistike drevney Rusi (XVI-XVII vv.)', *Issledovaniya po slavyanskomu literaturovedeniyu i fol'kloristike*, pp. 175-207 (the translated quotation is from p. 207); cf. further *id.*, 'Erazm Rotterdamsky v russkom perevode XVII veka' (*Slavyanskaya filologiya*, I, Moscow, 1958, pp. 275-330, esp. 275-8). For an only slightly different view on humanism in 15th-century Russia, cf. F. v. Lilienfeld, 'Vorboten und Träger des "Humanismus" im Russland Ivans III' (*Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, I, pp. 387-95).

²⁰ See M. P. Alekseyev, *op. cit.*, p. 183; cf. further, for example, R. A. Klostermann, *Maxim Grek in der Legende* [n.p., n.d.], p. 181; F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, pp. 313-14; D. Čiževskij, *History of Russian Literature*, pp. 291-300.

²¹ Cf. F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, pp. 271-2, 316-19; D. Čiževskij, *op. cit.*, pp. 154, 234.

adduces some impressive evidence of a considerably deepened knowledge of classical (Greek as well as Latin) authors in 15th- to 17th-century Russia.²² Yet it was only in western Russia or, to be exact, in the Ukraine and in Belorussia, that any truly humanist literature ever flourished. This literature and its relationship not only to Western European but particularly to Polish and Muscovite writings has recently been made the object of a separate study by the prominent Soviet Renaissance specialist I. N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov.²³

The earliest and strongest exposure of Eastern Slavs to Western influences took place in Galicia, roughly corresponding to the medieval principality of Galich (Halich; subsequently known also as Red Ruthenia). Its new capital L'vov (Lwów, L'viv), founded in the 13th century by the Galician-Volhynian prince Daniil Romanovich, became towards the end of the 15th century a multilingual cultural centre where Ruthenians and Poles mixed with Germans, Armenians and Jews, and even with Greeks and Italians. Operating under the so-called Magdeburg Law, L'vov and its proud burghers managed to achieve a certain degree of autonomy *vis-à-vis* the Polish Crown and neighbouring feudal lords. The letters 'SPQL' (standing for *Senatus Populusque Leopoliensis*) on the statue of the allegorical lion symbolising the 'Republic', as the local patriots of L'vov liked to refer to their city, clearly bear witness to the genuine Renaissance spirit of an emerging well-to-do social class. Here was truly a meeting ground of Byzantine and Latin cultural and religious traditions. The people of L'vov adhered either to Greek Orthodoxy if they were Ruthenian or Greek (or else emigrants from the Balkans), or to Roman Catholicism if they were Poles, polonised Germans or Italians, while the local Armenians and Jews formed separate ethnic-religious groups within the larger community of the city.

As Golenishchev-Kutuzov pertinently points out, the 16th-century Galician and other Ruthenian writers are usually excluded, both by Soviet and by Polish literary scholars, from the history of Ukrainian or Belorussian literature if they, as for example Pavel Rusin of Krosno, wrote their poetry or orations in Latin (rather than in the vernacular), not to speak of the many Ukrainians writing in Polish, the preferred language of the upper class, who are therefore naturally counted among the representatives of Polish literature.²⁴ One such

²² M. P. Alekseyev, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-7.

²³ Cf. I. N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, *Gumanizm u vostochnykh slavyan (Ukraina i Belorussiya)*, Moscow, 1963 (contribution to the 5th International Congress of Slavists).

²⁴ Actually, Pavel Rusin of Krosno (Paulus Crosnensis Ruthenus) was of German origin, even though his awareness of being of German nationality is at least controversial: → W. Weintraub, 'Italian-Polish Cultural Relations' (*Slavic Review*, XXV, I, New York, March 1966, pp. 136-7); K. Żantuan, 'Between Author and Reviewer' (*ibid.*, XXVI, 2, June 1967, p. 310).

Polish-Ukrainian poet, writing exclusively in Polish and in Latin (but not in Ukrainian) was the refined humanist Szymon Szymonowicz (Simon Simonides) who introduced the eclogue (*sielanka*) into Polish literature, drawing both on classical and on local Ruthenian traditions.²⁵ Golenishchev-Kutuzov, perhaps not without reason, finds it unfair to exclude from Ukrainian and Belorussian literature those Ruthenians who wrote in Latin or even Polish while, at the same time, histories of literature in Poland generally include a self-assertive account of a considerable number of neo-Latin poets of Polish nationality. Another confusing aspect is that the writers of Western Russia, ruled by Poland-Lithuania, are usually considered Russian or, rather, 'Ruthenian' (i.e., East Slavonic) not on the basis of their own national consciousness but in accordance with their religious beliefs, that is to say, only if they were and remained Orthodox. On the other hand, religious diversity and vacillation (namely, between Catholicism and one of the existing varieties of Protestantism) have never been considered, and rightly so, a valid criterion of Polish nationality. The impact of Polish language and literature on cultural life in Western Russia is generally acknowledged and has been fairly well investigated.²⁶ By contrast, the 'Ruthenian' element in early Polish culture and literature has so far not received sufficient attention. Yet it manifests itself both in the colloquial language spoken at the Jagellonian court in Cracow, and in the works of such outstanding Polish Renaissance writers as Rej, Kochanowski and Szymonowicz, as well as in the writings of the brothers Bartłomiej and Szymon Zimorowicz from L'vov, which already belong to the age of the literary Baroque. In addition to this intellectual exchange between Poland and the Ukraine from the late Middle Ages to the early Baroque, certain expressions of western culture, which had found their way to Muscovy, now indirectly also reached the Ruthenian lands.

Another important centre of Western Russian culture in the Renaissance period was Vilnyus (Wilno, Vilna), the capital of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which gradually became more closely united with Poland proper. Vilnyus, like L'vov, was a truly international city. Beside Lithuanians and Poles, Belorussians, Tatars, Armenians and other nationalities had settled here. As an important administrative centre of the Polish-Lithuanian state, Vilnyus became the scene of much political and cultural activity. Members of the Jagellonian dynasty, which had its origins in Lithuania, continued to show interest and concern for their former capital. Bona

²⁵ Cf. M. Kridl, *A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture*, The Hague, 1956, pp. 101-3; J. Krzyżanowski, *Historia literatury polskiej. Alegoryzm-preromantyzm*, Warsaw, 1964, pp. 214-21.

²⁶ See, for example, A. Martel, *La langue polonaise dans les pays ruthènes*, Lille, 1938.

Sforza, the wife of the Polish king Sigismund I (called the Old), spent a considerable time in Vilnius supervising, among other things, its reconstruction by specially invited Italian architects. Also the last Jagellonian king of Poland, Sigismund August, retained a keen interest in Vilnius, in its political, cultural and religious life. However, in contrast to L'vov, Vilnius never was a predominantly East Slavonic city, and the beginnings of Belorussian literature are rather to be found in provincial towns and cultural centres spread over an area extending east of Vilnius.

From the 1630s onward Kiev emerged, once more, as the leading centre of East Slavonic cultural, if not political, life. Of particular importance was the Kievan Academy, founded by the metropolitan Petro Mohyla after the model of the Polish Zamoyski Academy (in Zamość), and designed as a means of defence against polonisation and catholicisation. And when in the later part of the 17th and in the beginning of the 18th century Belorussians and Ukrainians, such as Simeon Polots'kyy or Feofan Prokopovych, put their imprint on Russian Baroque literature, it was in this famed Kiev Academy that many of them had received their western education.²⁷

VII

After this rather elaborate detour to what, after all, must be considered the geographical periphery of Renaissance culture in the Slavonic world, let us return to what properly could be termed the heartland of Slavonic Renaissance civilisation. This area includes primarily Poland and Croatia, with the latter divided into the coastal region of Dalmatia and the Hungarian-dominated 'Pannonian' Croatia. Hungary itself, while not Slavonic, can be viewed as a territory bridging, as it were, the cultural gap between Poland and Croatia. As already mentioned, Bohemia-Moravia, although geographically furthest advanced to the west, participated in the European Renaissance, but only to a very limited extent, due to the Hussite movement and its political and social ramifications. As I have recently dealt with Renaissance literature, especially drama, in Dalmatia in another context,²⁸ I shall here focus my attention on the other main sphere of Slavonic Renaissance literature—Poland. However, one fundamental difference between Renaissance literature in Dalmatian Croatia and in Poland should, perhaps, once more be emphasised and somewhat elaborated. Dalmatian literature

²⁷ Cf. D. Čiževskij, *History of Russian Literature*, pp. 320–6, 358–67; J. Matl, *op. cit.*, pp. 166–9 (with further references). On the Kievan Academy and its founder, see now also W. Shimoniak, *The Reforms of Peter Mohyla* (Marquette University, Slavic Institute Papers, 20, Milwaukee, Wis., 1965).

²⁸ Cf. my forthcoming essay 'Renaissance Drama in Ragusa' (in *Proceedings of the Conference . . .*).

can, for all practical purposes, be considered an extension and outgrowth of the literary Renaissance as it had developed in its original homeland, Italy. The main issue underlying virtually all discussion and evaluation of Croatian Renaissance writers is, therefore, their degree of independence and their respective share in adapting Italian models and, on the other hand, in utilising local tradition. It is in this controversial light that we have to appraise the contribution to European literature even of the greatest of all Ragusan writers of the Renaissance period, that of the playwright Marin Držić, considered by some a forerunner not only of Shakespeare (with his pastoral drama *Plakir*, also known as *Grižula*, strikingly reminiscent in many respects of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*) but also of Molière (cf., for example, his erudite comedy *Skup*, an early counterpart of *L'Avare*). As for the literature of inland Croatia in the Renaissance period it is, by and large, clearly inferior to that of Dalmatia and presupposes, for its proper understanding and evaluation, a familiarity with contemporary Hungarian culture and literature.²⁹ By comparison, Polish Renaissance literature cannot simply be viewed as echoing the literature of one particular country but should rather be seen as an integral part of European Renaissance literature at large, influenced by and in turn influencing the literatures of a great many countries. The impact made by the literature of Poland on European thought and writing applies particularly, of course, to the significant literary output produced by Poles (including polonised Ruthenians, Germans etc.) in Latin (cf. above), whereas Polish literature in the narrow—and strict—sense influenced primarily the literatures of other Slavonic peoples, in particular, as already indicated, those of the Eastern Slavs.

If we are to consider the development of Slavonic literature on a comparative basis it can justly be claimed that whereas in the Middle Ages Slavonic literature had reached one of its peaks in the Gothic period of Old Czech poetry, in the 16th century the climax had shifted to Poland. Paraphrasing a famous statement by the Russian literary scholar Viktor Shklovsky (and quoted, among others, by Roman Jakobson) it can be argued that the line of literary inheritance in the Slavonic world goes from uncle to nephew rather than from father to son, and that one thus can consider Polish Renaissance poetry as the continuation and culmination of Old Czech poetry. This, incidentally, does not need to be understood

²⁹ Cf., for example, J. Matl, *op. cit.*, pp. 131–7; I. N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, *Ital'yanskoye Vozrozhdeniye . . .*, pp. 126–68; see further L. Hadrovics, 'Rapports de la poésie hongroise ancienne avec celles de l'Europe centrale', in: *Littérature hongroise—Littérature européenne. Études de littérature comparée*, Budapest, 1964, pp. 105–27. On some specific problems of Renaissance and humanism in Hungary, see further the papers in *Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, II, pp. 3–103.

in an altogether metaphoric and general sense. The Polish Renaissance author Łukasz Górnicki, in his much-acclaimed *Dworzanin polski*, patterned on Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*, specifically mentions Czech as the main source for enriching and refining, lexically and phonetically, the spoken and written language of the Polish educated class.³⁰

Along with original poetry, which reached a high level in Renaissance Poland in the literary œuvre of Jan Kochanowski and the best of his followers, such as Mikołaj Sęp Szarzyński (who died at the early age of thirty-one) or Szymon Szymonowicz, there was another current, or rather undercurrent, in Polish literature which emerged particularly in the 16th century. I am referring to the fictional genre of tales and romances which were translated into Polish or otherwise transplanted, by adaptation or imitation, from Western Europe. Largely of Oriental, Byzantine and Romance origin, these stories flourished and were reproduced in Southern and Western Europe throughout the Middle Ages. While many of them are known also in medieval Slavonic (particularly Serbian and Czech) variants, this genre (to be understood here in a thematic rather than formal sense) developed fully in Poland only in the age of the Renaissance. It was primarily the Polish versions that in turn served as sources and models for subsequent translations and adaptations into Ukrainian and Russian.³¹

This literary category, however, cannot actually be considered characteristic of the Renaissance in more than a superficial way. Yet Poland was patently typical of the general cultural complexity of the European Renaissance. This applies not only to the dichotomy of vernacular *vs* neo-Latin (humanist) literature but also to the coexistence and interaction of humanism and the Reformation in 16th-century Poland. It may occasionally be difficult to draw a clear line separating in Poland, as elsewhere, the Renaissance (as a new spirit and attitude searching for new artistic and literary themes and forms) and humanism (as primarily a new trend of learning and scholarship); nor is it easy rigorously to discriminate between certain aspects of humanism and different varieties of the Reformation, the latter—religious—trend drawing largely on the findings of humanistic scholarship. Among the most outstanding Polish Renaissance writers were not only representatives of the Reformation, such as the 'father of Polish literature' Mikołaj Rej,

³⁰ Cf. R. Jakobson, 'The Kernel of Comparative Slavic Literature', pp. 56–7; on Górnicki, see also, for example, J. Kryżanowski, *op. cit.*, pp. 134–8.

³¹ For a general discussion of the travelling tale in Slavonic literature, see J. Matl, *op. cit.*, pp. 48–114; for an account and classification of Polish romances and story books in the 16th century, cf. J. Kryżanowski, *Romans polski wieku XVI*, Warsaw, 1962 (revised edition; with an English summary, pp. 283–94).

an ardent Calvinist and prolific prose writer, but also spokesmen for the Counter-Reformation—above all the Jesuit Piotr Skarga, author of the famous accusatory ‘Diet Sermons’ (*Kazania Sejmowe*) which, however, were never actually delivered before the Polish Parliament.

The beginnings of Polish humanism are connected with the names of foreigners who, for one reason or another, had come to Poland. Among them were the Italian humanist Filippo Buonacorsi, known under the name of Callimachus (Kallimach), who, together with the German Konrad Celtis, founded the humanistic *Societas Vistulana* of Cracow. Both Buonacorsi and Celtis were disciples of the famous Florentine Platonist Marsilio Ficino. Moreover, as the renowned Jagellonian University, following a conservative course of medieval scholasticism, began to lose significance and prestige, an increasing number of young Poles went abroad to study at Italian and German universities. As a result, the intellectual life of Poland became truly internationalised and virtually all the outstanding Polish writers of the period, except Rej, completed at least part of their education outside their native country. It was, therefore, only natural that their writings should in most cases reflect the broad spirit of the European Renaissance and of humanism. The courts of the Polish kings, especially Sigismund August and Stefan Batory, and of the great magnates, such as Jan Zamoyski, or of the princes of the Church (for example, Archbishop Grzegorz of Sanok), provided many Polish Renaissance writers and scholars with the means of support necessary to free them for their creative activity.³²

VIII

The life and work of Jan Kochanowski may be considered in every respect typical of a Polish Renaissance writer. At the same time, Kochanowski doubtless marks the absolute peak of Polish literature of that period. In fact, he is generally claimed to be the most outstanding Renaissance poet in any Slavonic language while in the history of Polish literature he is considered the greatest before Mickiewicz. Belonging to the landed gentry, Kochanowski studied in Cracow, Padua and Königsberg. In Padua (and during his travels in Italy) he acquired a thorough humanistic education and familiarity with ancient as well as neo-Latin authors and poets. His Latin elegies (published only in the year of his death, 1584, together

³² For details and comprehensive treatment cf., *inter alia*, I. N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, *Ital'janskoye Vozrozhdeniye* . . ., pp. 212–320; J. Krzyżanowski, *Historia literatury polskiej*, pp. 89–255; M. Kridl, *op. cit.*, pp. 39–92. On some problems of Renaissance and humanism in Poland, in particular on neo-Latin poetry and writing, cf. also the pertinent papers in *Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, II, pp. 107–246.

with his odes and some less significant poetry) bear witness to his achievements as a Latin poet. In Paris, having become acquainted with the work of Pierre Ronsard and other poets of the Pléiade, Kochanowski saw, as he had seen in Italy, the triumph of the new poetry in the vernacular, a triumph he was to repeat in his own country. In Königsberg, where he studied as the protégé of the founder of the new university, Duke Albrecht, Kochanowski seems to have maintained connections with Polish protestants without, however, changing camps to become a protestant himself. After having spent some time at various feudal courts and having been attached, at least formally, to the royal court of Sigismund August, Kochanowski around 1571 withdrew from public life and sought refuge in his small idyllic estate of Czarnolas, where most of his masterpieces were written.

Kochanowski's literary output in Polish spans the whole range of Renaissance poetry. His early works include a tale in verse, *Szachy* ('Chess'), two satirical-political poems, *Zgoda* ('Agreement', with a plea for religious unity in a Catholic sense) and *Satyr albo Dżiki mąż* ('The Satyr or the Wild Man', with a didactic-patriotic undertone) as well as panegyrical and love poetry, the latter in the Petrarchan vein. In addition to some less fortunate attempts in the historical epic genre, Kochanowski very successfully tried his hand at the epigram, introduced into Poland by Callimachus and cultivated, among others, by Rej. His *Fraszki* ('Trifles'), short poems and prose pieces on a variety of subjects, both light and serious, are true masterpieces of a pointed, compact style; besides original works Kochanowski's 'Trifles' also contain some translations from Greek and Latin collections of epigrams (Anacreon and Martialis). He is also the author of a number of epigrammatic pieces in Latin (*Foricoenia*). Related to the 'Trifles' were Kochanowski's 'Songs' (*Pieśni*), usually in stanzas and with the lyrical element more prominent than in the 'Trifles'. While the topics of the 'Songs' are as varied as those of the 'Trifles', the praise of virtue, of spiritual balance, and of moderation in the face of the instability of fortune and vanity of material things is a recurrent theme. The general tone of these 'Songs' is philosophical rather than religious. Yet Kochanowski is also the most prominent religious poet of the Polish Renaissance. His famous hymn *Czego chcesz od nas, Panie, za Twe hojne dary* ('What Do You Want from Us, O Lord, for All Your Generous Gifts'), is supposed to have been written while he was still in France. Kochanowski's most important piece of religious poetry was his paraphrase of the Psalter, based on Buchanan's Latin adaptation and drawing on contemporary Polish versions of the Psalter. The *Psalterz Dawidów* ('Psalter of David') appeared in 1579 and later served as a model for

Simeon Polots'kyy's Russian Psalter translation. Strong religious undertones are also present in Kochanowski's collection *Treny* ('Laments'), occasioned by the death of his infant daughter Orszula and considered by many an unsurpassed masterpiece of Polish literature. These poems tell the unique, lyrical story of the suffering and despair of the bereaved father, overpowered by merciless and irrational forces. It is a challenge to the poet's attitude of personal detachment and to his philosophy of spiritual balance. Even his Christian faith in immortality is shaken. A truly tragic document of human helplessness, the 'Laments' nevertheless end in a note of consolation: the poet's stoicism and his gift of poetic expression will help him overcome his loss.³³ Among other works by Kochanowski, written during the last period of his life, his controversial poetic cycle *Pieśń świętojańska o Sobótce* ('The Song of St John's Eve') deserves mention. It combines a classic-inspired view of the pleasures of country life with an interest in, and understanding of, Polish local traditions and, at the same time, reveals the poet's sublimed eroticism. Finally, Kochanowski also wrote a full-fledged tragedy, *Odprawa posłów greckich* ('The Dismissal of the Greek Envoys'), based on Homeric motifs but alluding to events in the history of Poland. Written in blank verse on the occasion of Jan Zamoyski's wedding, it is full of patriotic thoughts expressed in lengthy lyrical passages. Kochanowski with his grandiosely designed tragedy, continuing a tradition revived in Italy and France in the early and mid-16th century, demonstrated his own closeness to classical antiquity. Compared to his lyrical oeuvre, however, Kochanowski's example in this genre made less of an impact on his contemporaries and on Polish literature in the centuries to follow.³⁴

³³ Kochanowski's *Treny* can, granted many differences, be compared with Egil Skallagrímsson's Old Icelandic poem *Sonatorrek* ('The Loss of Sons') both as regards their respective individualism (expressed within the framework of a prevailing system of poetic norms and devices), central lyrical theme, and ultimate atonement by the father's poetic release.

³⁴ The above brief account of Kochanowski's literary output is merely intended to convey a general idea of the quality and quantity of this foremost Slavonic Renaissance writer's contribution to the culture of his time. Certainly no other writer can better represent Slavonic Renaissance literature. The literature on Kochanowski is quite extensive. Of general treatments cf., for example, J. Krzyżanowski, *Historia literatury polskiej*, pp. 171–95; J. Kleiner, *Żarys dziejów literatury polskiej*, Wrocław/Warsaw/Cracow, 1963, pp. 61–84; M. Kridl, *op. cit.*, pp. 62–76; I. N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, *Ital'ianskoye Vozrozhdeniye . . .*, pp. 273–94, with further references and suggesting a somewhat different—less positive—assessment of Kochanowski's *Treny* (see esp. p. 291); cf. ➔ W. Weintraub, 'Italian–Polish Cultural Relations' (*Slavic Review*, XXV, 1, March 1966, p. 139); K. Zantuan, 'Between Author and Reviewer' (*Slavic Review*, XXVI, 2, June 1967, pp. 309–1 ➔ H. Birnbaum, Review of Golenishchev-Kutuzov, *Ital'ianskoye . . .* (*Renaissance News*, XVIII, 1965, pp. 237–8). On Kochanowski's *Treny*, see, in particular, also J. Pietrkiewicz, 'The Medieval Dream-Formula in Kochanowski's *Treny*' (*The Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXI, 1952/3, pp. 388–404). On Kochanowski's place in Renaissance literature, cf. further, e.g., Z. Szmydtowa, (*op. cit.*, pp. 5–158, especially pp. 139–58: 'Kochanowski na tle polskiego i europejskiego Renesansu'); W. Floryan, *Forma poetycka 'Pieśni' Jana Kochanowskiego wobec kierunków literatury renesansowej*, Wrocław,

In concluding these loosely sketched reflections on the Slavonic Renaissance it should be pointed out that while this paper has focused on Slavonic and, to some extent, Latin literature, among the Slavs, as elsewhere, *belles-lettres* are but one of the many aspects and manifestations of Renaissance culture and civilisation. For a true assessment, Slavonic Renaissance literature should, therefore, be viewed in its broader cultural context. Though varying in different Slavonic countries, Renaissance art and architecture in Dubrovnik or Prague, Cracow or Moscow all show the impact and radiation of the European Renaissance and prove, wherever they are encountered, the same spirit and love of beauty that we are so familiar with from Italy, France and the rest of Western Europe.

1948. On his style and language, see in particular W. Weintraub, *Styl Jana Kochanowskiego*, Cracow, 1932 (a new monograph on Kochanowski by Prof. Weintraub is currently in preparation); St. Słoiński, *O języku Jana Kochanowskiego*, Warsaw, 1949; and St. Rospond, *Język i artyzm językowy Jana Kochanowskiego*, Wrocław, 1961. On Kochanowski's Latin poetry, see also A. Fei, 'Kochanowski polski i łaciński', *Pamiętnik literacki*, 1935, pp. 319-39.